



STUDY OF PHYSICAL WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT & IT'S IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE WITH REFERENCE TO LARGE SCALE MANUFACTURING COMPANIES LOCATED IN NASIK CITY

Dr. Manisha Shirsath

ABSTRACT

Organizations must step outside their traditional roles and comfort zones to look at new ways of working. They have to create a work environment where people enjoy what they do, feel like they have a purpose, have pride in what they do, and can reach their potential. This research paper aims to study physical workplace environment & its effect towards employees' performance. For this research 50 large scale manufacturing industries located at nasik district were taken with 100 sample size.

KEYWORDS: physical workplace environment; employees' performance.

INTRODUCTION:

Management's new challenge is to form an environment that attracts, retain and motivate its workforce. The responsibility lies with managers and supervisors at all levels of the organization. Businesses must step outside their time-honored roles and comfort zones to look at new ways of working. They have to create a working environment where people enjoy what they do, feel like they have a purpose, have pride in what they do and can reach their potential. The work environment affects employee morale, productivity and engagement- both positively and negatively. It is not just a twist of fate that new programs addressing lifestyle changes, work life balance, health and fitness previously that were not considered key benefits are now primary considerations of potential employees, and common practices among the most admired companies. Today's work environment is different, diverse and constantly changing. The typical employer/employee relationship of old has been turned upside down. Workers are living in a growing economy and have almost limitless job opportunities. This combination of factors has created an environment where the business needs its employees more than the employees need the business. In an effort to motivate workers, firms have put into practice a number of activities such as performance based pay, employee involvement, recruiting agreements, practices to help balance work and family life as well as various forms of information sharing. In addition to motivation, workers need the skills and the ability to do their job effectively. It is the quality of the employee's work environment that most impacts on the level of employee's motivation and subsequent performance. How well employees engage with the organization, especially with their immediate environment, influences to a great extent their error rate, level of uniqueness and collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and ultimately how long they stay in the job. Comfortable office design motivates the employees and increases their performance to a large extent.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY :

1. To study the various physical workplace factors present in work environment.
2. To determine the impact of work environment on employees' performance.
3. To give the suggestions to problems that affects the work environment

HYPOTHESIS:

There is relationship between physical work environment & employee performance.

METHODOLOGY:

This research study adopted exploratory research design to study various physical environment factors & there impact on employee performance. The population for study is large scale manufacturing industries located in nasik city. 45 organisation were selected for study & from each organization 20 respondent were randomly selected to give total 900 respondent for study

The instrument used for the study, is a questionnaire that made use of existing structured scales with contained Five – Point scales. It using a Likert scale with responses ranging from Strongly Agree= 5; Agree = 4; Neutral=3, Disagree = 2; Strongly Disagree = 1.

Tool for Analysis :In this study, various tools of statistics have been used for the purpose of analysis, Arithmetic Mean, standard deviation, mode, Chi-square, Pearson's correlation coefficient. The uses of all these techniques have been made as per the requirement of the analysis.

Test Criteria :The calculated value of χ^2 is compared with the table value of χ^2 for given degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. If the calculated value of $\chi^2 > \chi^2_{0.05}$ the difference between the theory and observation, is said to be significant at 0.05 level of significance.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS:

from the table shown below in which mean score value for Workplace physical factor is 4.01 which is at high level. It show that there is proper cleanliness, waste & affluent removed from organization, proper ventilation & lighting arrangement, clean & safe drinking water, spittoons are place at several appropriate places, proper toilet facility, appropriate washing facility, facility for sitting, first aid appliances, proper canteen facility, restroom facility & crèche facility are provided at workplace with proper regular maintenance. Above table shows that all the item are at high level but there is item no 9,10 for which employees have more positive attitude as compared to others and less positive attitude towards the item no 1,2,11 & 12.

In overall most of employees of large scale manufacturing companies located at Nasik, satisfied with their organization physical workplace environment.

Item	Physical factor	Mean	Level
1	Cleanliness at your workplace	3.85	High
2	Waste and affluent generated in the organization removed from the factory with proper treatment.	3.93	High
3	Ventilation & lighting arrangement	4.06	High
4	Clean & safe drinking water	4.12	High
5	Spittoons are placed at several appropriate locations	4.12	High
6	Proper toilet facility.	4.14	High
7	Appropriate washing facilities provided	4.07	High
8	Facility for sitting	4.09	High
9	First aid appliances	4.13	High
10	Proper Canteen facility.	4.13	High
11	Proper Restroom facility	3.93	High
12	Creche facility for worker's children.	3.56	High
	Mean	4.01	High

Hypothesis testing:

Physical Work Environment & Employee Performance.

H_0 - There is no relationship between physical work environment & employee performance.

H_1 - There is relationship between physical work environment & employee performance.

Table 6.5.13.1 Physical Work Environment & Employee Performance.

Performance	Work Environment	Total		
	Good	Average	Bad	
Good	45 (41.4) [0.31]	0 (3.6) [3.6]	0	45
Average	1 (4.6) [2.82]	4 (0.4) [32.4]	0	5
Bad	0	0	0	0
Total	46	4	0	50 (Grand Total)
Chi-Square Value	Degree of freedom(D.F)	P-Value		
39.1304	4	0.00001		

The P-value is 0.00001. the result is significant at $p < 0.05$.

The above table gives the distribution of respondents, from large scale manufacturing organization, according to their performance on the basis of physical work environment factor of work environment. Majority (45) organization's respondents were satisfied with physical work environment and these employees performing well. Only 5 organization's respondents were not satisfied with these physical work environment and performing average. To check the difference in views of respondents from large scale manufacturing organization regarding work environment factor(physical work environment) & employee performance, the researcher has applied Chi – Square test and obtained corresponding p – value. The Chi – Square value is 28.72 with p – value 0.00001. As p – value is less than 0.05; we reject H0 and accept alternate hypothesis that there is relationship between physical work environment & employee performance.

Researcher also identified what type of relationship exists between these two variables (physical work environment & employee performance) with the help of Pearson's correlation coefficient as follows....

$$r = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}$$

Table 6.5.13.2 Relationship between Physical Work Environment & Employee Performance.

$\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})$	$\sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2}$	r
5.67	6.44	0.88

Pearson's correlation coefficient value (r) is 0.88 which shows very strong positive relationship between two variables that is physical work environment & employee performance.

FINDINGS:**Percent Agree(Agree + strongly Agree)**

80% or higher
60% to 79
59% or less

findings

Organizational Strength
Emerging Best Practices
Areas For improvement

Item	Physical factor	Strongly agree & agree %	Findings
1	Cleanliness at your workplace	74.77	Emerging Best Practices
2	Waste and affluent generated in the organization removed from the factory with proper treatment.	83.00	Organizational Strength
3	Ventilation & lighting arrangement	75.00	Emerging Best Practices
4	Clean & safe drinking water	84.77	Organizational Strength
5	Spittoons are placed at several appropriate locations	84.77	Organizational Strength
6	Proper toilet facility.	82.44	Organizational Strength
7	Appropriate washing facilities provided	81.34	Organizational Strength

8	Facility for sitting	84.77	Organizational Strength
9	First aid appliances	83.00	Organizational Strength
10	Proper Canteen facility.	83.33	Organizational Strength
11	Proper Restroom facility	71.67	Emerging Best Practices
12	Creche facility for worker's children.	71.67	Emerging Best Practices

CONCLUSION:

Workplace environment plays a vital role in motivating employees to perform their assigned work. Since money is not a sufficient motivator in encouraging the workplace performance required in today's competitive business environment. Managers and supervisors will need to be comfortable with working with the whole gamut of workplace factors that influence employee motivation. Skills required include the ability to engage employees in mutual goal setting clarify role expectations and provide regular performance back. Time and energy will also need to be given to providing relevant performance incentives, managing processes, providing adequate resources and workplace coaching. Last but not least, to drive their organizations to peak performance managers and supervisors must put out front the human face of their organization. Paramount here is the human-to-human interaction through providing individualized support and encouragement to each and every employee. From this study it is known that public sector organizations are providing a good workplace environment to their employees, which does not affect more on their work performance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- I. Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems,1(1) Retrieved December 20, 2011 from <http://www.ijecbs.com/January2011/N4Jan2011.pdf>.
- II. C.R. Kothari & Gaurav Garg, (2014), 3rd edition, New age international publication, "Research Methodology Methods & Techniques", Page no: 1-22, 89-109,235-247 & 179-209
- III. Panneerselvam R,(2012), 2nd edition, PHI publication, "Research Methodology", Page no:10-20 & 150-166
- IV. C.R. Kothari & Gaurav Garg, (2014), 3rd edition, New age international publication, "Research Methodology Methods & Techniques", Page no: 1-22, 89-109,235-247 & 179-209

REFERENCES:

- I. Akhtar, N. (2014). Interior Design and its Impact on of Employees' Productivity in Telecom Sector, Pakistan. Journal of Asian Business Strategy, 74-82.(1)
- II. Akintayo, D. (2012). Working environment, workers' morale and perceived productivity in industrial organizations in Nigeria. Education Research Journal, 87-93.(17)
- III. Ali, A. Y. (2013). Working Conditions And Employees' Productivity In Manufacturing Companies In Sub-Saharan African Context: Case Of Somalia. Educational Research International, 67-78.(7)
- IV. Andrew, J. S. (2008). OFFICE SPACE, CHANGING WORKPLACES AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE. School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen's University.(15)
- V. Asmui. (2012). The Importance of Work Environment Facilities. International Journal of Learning & Development.(19)
- VI. Denison. (n.d.). Workers physical surrounding - Impact Bottom Line Accounting: Smarts Pros.com. Academy of Management Review, 619-654.(21)
- VII. Designers, A. S. (1998). HOW DESIGN INCREASES PRODUCTIVITY: EXPERT INSIGHTS. American Society of Interior Designers.(13)
- VIII. Foldspang, L. (2014). Working environment and productivity : A register-based analysis of Nordic enterprises. Nordic Council of Ministers.(16)
- IX. Greef, M. D. (2004). Quality of Working Environment Productivity — Research Findings and Case Studies. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.(3)
- X. Hameed, A. (2009). Impact of Office Design on Employees' Productivity: A Case study of Banking Organizations of Abbottabad, Pakistan. Journal of Public Affairs and Administration.(4)
- XI. Haynes, B. P. (2008). The Impact of Office Layout on Productivity. Journal of Facilities Management, 189-201.(8)